

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 22, 1999 LB 142

is proposing now. And I, frankly, don't know what the fate of the bill is in the Appropriations Committee, but I think there's...has been a broad awareness that somehow there were going to be extra dollars generated by the checkoff. And whether or not Senator...I think it was Senator Wehrbein's bill is the best approach I really don't have any opinion at the moment, but it seemed a better way for...at least for the members of Revenue Committee, to fund Senator Stuhr's bill on a limited time because ethanol uses products that are subject to the checkoff and it is a way of returning into the marketplace some of the...some of the checkoff dollars. That's as simple as I can state the rationale for the committee amendment for the use of checkoff dollars to fund a two-cent reduction in the excise tax, at least on a temporary basis.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Further discussion? Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Mr. President, members of the body, I'm going to be brief 'cause I will be repeating some of what I said this morning, but I also thought I ought to rise and remind, at least, some that are interested, I strongly oppose at this point the...suspending the germaneness and the Amendment 582. I appreciate the discussion on this and that's not my issue. The issue is this specific amendment. Therefore, the germaneness rule I oppose too. Is because the EPIC Fund is and was designed for ethanol expansion, ethanol production in Nebraska. It's worked fairly successfully. It's true, there's a little excess money being built up. If you recall, that is coming from the corn checkoff, about \$8 million a year, give or take, depending on the size of the corn crop. There is about \$6 million of General Fund, but those funds were designed for ethanol growth and expansion in the state of Nebraska. Because Sutherland has not come on at full strength and probably won't be until August, there is a little bit of surplus money in that fund and would be some into the future perhaps. It's my thought and several of us, I'm not alone in this, that if that money were to be there that it ought properly to go for further ethanol expansion. It is a true investment in agriculture. If we can gain additional capacity, additional production facilities and do it reasonably using that money that is there, that that is an appropriate use for that money, and so I strongly oppose using the EPIC Fund for